

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 21 2007

REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner Pantoliano for the telephone call today in which Examiner Pantoliano indicated that claims 1-4 and 6 were allowable. A minor correction has been made to claim 1 to recite a computer program "product", instead of just a computer program.

Examiner Pantoliano also indicated that claims 21-23 have allowable subject matter except for 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112, second paragraph objections. Applicant has canceled claims 24-35 above to expedite allowance, and amended claims 21-23 to overcome the 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112, second paragraph objections. The Examiner objected to claims 21-23 asserting that the means correspond to computer program function and that was insufficient for a computer system claim. To resolve this objection and expedite allowance of the remaining claims, Applicant has added to independent claim 21 a central processing unit, a computer readable media and a recitation that the means are loaded onto the computer readable media in the computer system for execution on the central processing unit. The following is support for this amendment to the claims. Figure 1 illustrates an object removal tool 14 loaded into a computer 10. The computer 10 includes an operating system 7 coupled to a central processing unit. The object removal tool 14 is coupled to the central processing unit. Page 5 lines 9-10 of the specification states "A program tool 14 has been loaded into system 10 to reset application 12 in accordance with the present invention." Page 6 lines 12 et seq. state "An operator starts program tool 14 in step 50. Then program tool 14" [the specification then recites the operation of program tool 14 during its execution]. Thus, the foregoing amendment to claim 21 is supported in the specification. Dependent claims 22-23 have also been amended to recite that their means are loaded onto the computer readable media in the computer system for execution on the central processing unit. Therefore, claims 21-23 recite sufficient structure for a computer system claim, and should be allowable, overcoming the 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112, second paragraph objections.

10/728,518

8


END920030130US1

Even though Applicant has canceled claims 24-35 herein, Applicant is not conceding that these claims are not patentable over the cited Prior Art. Rather, the amendments herein are made to facilitate expeditious allowance of the present patent application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue broader claims and claims 24-35 in a continuation and/or divisional patent application.

Based on the foregoing, the present patent application as amended above should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 2007
Telephone: 607-429-4368
Fax No.: 607-429-4119



Arthur J. Samodovitz
Reg. No. 31,297